## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Jin Ackerman, Case No.: 2:24-cv-00935-JAD-DJA

Plaintiff

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

v.

Curtis Rigney, et al.,

Defendants

**Order Acknowledging Voluntary Dismissal** 

[ECF Nos. 1, 5, 6]

Plaintiff Jin Ackerman filed this civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and applied to proceed in forma pauperis. 1 I screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, found some colorable claims, and granted Ackerman leave to file a first amended complaint (FAC).<sup>2</sup> Ackerman filed a motion to amend and a proposed FAC.<sup>3</sup> But before I screened the FAC,  $11\parallel$ Ackerman filed a motion to voluntarily dismiss "the instant complaint."<sup>4</sup>

This wording is a bit ambiguous. It could be read as a request either to dismiss the case 14 in its entirety or to dismiss the proposed FAC and proceed on the original complaint. But 15 Ackerman is an experienced litigant in this court, and in two past cases, he expressed a 16 preference to proceed on an original complaint after a first screening by filing a "Motion to Proceed Without Amended Complaint."<sup>5</sup> And Ackerman's motion to voluntarily dismiss does

18

13

19

20

<sup>1</sup> ECF No. 1

<sup>21</sup> <sup>2</sup> ECF No. 3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> ECF Nos. 5, 5-1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> ECF No. 6.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See Ackerman v. Drummond, et al., 3:23-cv-103, ECF No. 6 (D. Nev. May 24, 2023); Ackerman v. Moskoff, et al., 3:22-ev-555, ECF No. 5 (D. Nev. Jan. 20, 2023).

not resemble those past motions. So I construe the motion as Ackerman's request to voluntarily dismiss the case in its entirety. 3 Under Rule 41(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, "[a] plaintiff may dismiss an action without a court order by filing a notice of dismissal before the opposing party either serves an answer or a motion for summary judgment." No responsive pleading has been filed in this case, so I acknowledge that this case has been dismissed. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Ackerman's motion to voluntarily dismiss (ECF No. 6) is GRANTED. This case is dismissed in its entirety without prejudice. 8 9 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Ackerman's other pending motions (ECF Nos. 1, 5) are **DENIED** as moot. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court is directed to CLOSE THIS 11 12 CASE. 13 If Ackerman believes that I have misconstrued his motion to voluntarily dismiss, he may file a motion setting out his reasons for that belief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(1)<sup>7</sup> "within a reasonable time" not to exceed one year from entry of this order.<sup>8</sup> Dated: February 12, 2025 16 17 U.S. District V 18 19 20 21 <sup>6</sup> Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1)(A)(i).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> See Kemp v. United States, 596 U.S. 528, 533–34 (2022) (explaining that a party may seek relief from a judgment or order under Rule 60(b)(1) based on "mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect," and that the term "mistake" includes a judge's mistake of law or fact).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> See Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(c).